DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 907 CS 006 204

AUTHOR Wyatt, Flora; Campbell, Connie
TITLE Ten Years of Follow Through--What Have We Learned?
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (26th, New Orleans, LA, April 27-May 1, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged; Educational Research; Federal Programs; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Project Follow Through; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through program epitomizes many of the successes and failures of federally funded compensatory education. The program, designed to "follow through" in grades kindergarten through three on the documented gains of disadvantaged children graduating from Head Start, emerged as a planned variation experiment that systematically compared pupils enrolled in a variety of programs based on innovative educational models. The purpose was to find the best methods for educating poor and minority students. An evaluation of the Follow Through program showed that it was not as successful as was hoped: the various dynamics operating within the individual classrooms and schools influenced children's achievement more than any one educational approach or set of materials. However, some of the Follow Through models and similar programs for low-income children have produced results in a number of individual sites across the country. The characteristics of these successful models include outstanding leadership on the part of administrators, the ability to identify failure of past experiences and recognize the need for changing the model, the careful use of research and evaluation of elements of the instructional model, systematic teacher inservice training, and strong community support and political advocacy. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED205907

TEN YEARS OF FOLLOW THROUGH - WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

by

Flora Wyatt
University of Kansas

and

Connie Campbell
The Learning Exchange
Kansas City, Missouri

Paper presented at the
Annual Conference of the International
Reading Conference
April 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Flora Wyatt

Connie Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS006 204

TEN YEARS OF FOLLOW THROUGH - WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

When future archeologists study our educational system, they are likely to puzzle over the last decade. It will probably appear as a period of confusion, excitement, disappointment and maturity for American educators who tried to reform education through massive federal funding to meet, once and for all time, the needs of all children. The past period will be seen as one providing an incredible array of opportunities for educators to design, implement, and evaluate programs in ways never before attempted. Now that this period is coming to a close, what will history record that we have learned?

To answer this question, let us focus on one nation-wide federally funded educational program, Follow Through, which epitomizes many of successes and failures compensatory educators experienced with the help of government funding. Follow Through, a program designed to "follow through" in grades kindergarten through three on the documented gains of disadvantaged students graduating from Head Start, emerged as a planned variation experiment, designed to systematically compare pupils enrolled in different innovative educational models. These comparisons were to be made between models as well as between Follow Through students and control groups from non-Follow Through classes. It was hoped that the best methods for educating poor and minority students would develop.

Twenty-two different approaches were developed by sponsors of innovative educational programs. Sponsors worked with local school districts, or sites, which volunteered to implement a particular model of early childhood education. Over 180 sites participated in implementing programs ranging from highly structured programmed learning to open education. Some of the sponsors worked with as few as one site, others implemented programs at as many as eighteen sites. Both sponsors and sites received federal funding to implement innovations and participate in the quasi-experimental evaluation and research design.

Much of the controversy surrounding Follow Through has been the evaluation and comparison of Follow Through models within this research design. Enormous difficulties arose due to the large number of sponsors, participants, tests and evaluation instruments, and mismatched control groups. The Office of Education was forced to limit the total number of sponsors, sites, and children participating in the federal evaluation. It was also decided to reduce evaluation instruments primarily to a few standardized tests in order to maintain some control of an already overwhelming evaluation design. Overall, the scope of evaluation became much narrower than originally planned. As interpreted by House and fellow researchers reviewing the history and data of Follow Through (1978), the ultimate research question finally became "Which model works best?" rather than other questions such as "What makes the models work?" or "How can one make the models work better?"

Yet there continued to be much optimism that the new, exciting educational models would overcome these and other design difficulties. Many government administrators, sponsors, educators, and parents expected that the well financed innovative programs would "blow over the public schools," according to Robert Egbert, the original Office of Education director of Follow Through (House and others, 1978).

These words now echo as if said long, long ago in a galaxy far, far away. Follow Through did not blow over the public schools and did not revolutionize education for poor and minority children.

Abt Associates, the final evaluators selected by the Office of Education to interpret Follow Through data, ultimately found that:

> None of the seventeen models in the evaluation demonstrated that it could compensate consistently for the academic consequences of poverty... the Follow Through strategy of externally sponsored curricular change is not a reliable (author's italics) tool for raising the test scores of poor children; the strategy is too sensitive to too many influences over which it has no control. Local circumstances and behavior clearly have more to do with children's test performance than do the intentions, theories, and rhetoric of outside interveners. Taken as a whole, the evidence... (Stebbins and others, 1977) suggests that if a local school system has the potential for effective compensatory education, then outside resources of the Follow Through kind can sometimes catalyze the potential. But if not, intervention seems to be somewhat disruptive and counterproductive (Anderson and others, 1978, p. 162).

At the evaluation cost of $50 million we are left with the conclusions that scores of researchers have found in similar studies on much smaller scales than that of Follow Through: The various dynamics operating within the individual classrooms and schools influence

children's achievement more than any one educational approach or set of materials (Kennedy, 1978).

Despite the disappointing general conclusions of the Follow Through evaluation, some of the Follow Through models, and similar programs for low-income children, have produced results in a number of individual sites across the nation. Many researchers, including Stallings, Kaskowitz, Latto, McCarthy, Rath and others have examined these singular successes. Their findings, after more than a decade of Follow Through, provide the inevitable lessons for successful low-income schools with or without federal funding. Those lessons point to the need to focus on instructional leadership, recognize the need to change, believe in an instructional model, use evaluation and research to modify and improve model implementation, provide systematic inservice training, and develop community support and political advocacy. Let us look at some of these areas individually.

Outstanding Instructional Leadership

Probably of all the factors influencing successful school sites, the most important is selection of an administrator who is an instructional leader. Instructional leaders can be defined as administrators who regard their teachers as subject matter experts and professionals, but also feel it is their responsibility to help clarify goals, establish with teachers their specific objectives, monitor classroom and instructional needs and activities, and assume responsibility and accountability for their actions and the actions of their staffs. In

simple terms, instructional leaders know where they are going. They establish the direction the school will take, set goals, standards and expectations with the staff and community, and relate instructional material and managerial actions to these goals, standards, and expectations. Outstanding instructional leaders often have strong curriculum and instruction backgrounds, and use this expertise to diagnose problems and prescribe solutions with teachers much in the same way that teachers are expected to anticipate and respond to the needs of the students.

Additionally, outstanding instructional leaders are astute risk takers. Particularly in circumstances as politically charged as those of Follow Through, an instructional leader must capably handle diverse governmental, educational and community pressures, and at the same time maintain the direction of the school toward specific, measurable goals.

Realistically, it is very difficult to find an administrator of a school who has the expertise and time necessary for curriculum development, instructional supervision, staff and community involvement, problem solving at many levels, action planning, and risk taking. An administrative team of a principal and curriculum coordinator, each of whom have defined roles and highly support the program, is likely to be the most ideal. To secure such a team concept, some district-wide supervisory positions may need to be abolished to provide curriculum staff at the building levels.

Belief in Change and the Instructional Model

Successful Follow Through sites as well as those of other compensatory education programs tend to have identified the failure of past experiences and to recognize the need for changing the way their school and classrooms operated. At the building levels, decisions to participate in Follow Through tended to focus on the improvement of instruction and curriculum and the acceptance of one or another educational model on this basis.

Rath (1977) researched various Follow Through sites and has identified a number of components contributing to this recognition or readiness for change on the part of teachers, as well as their acceptance and commitment to an individual instructional model. She found that these components include the need or requirement that teachers participate voluntarily in the program. This "self selection" appears to determine to a great extent the amount of energy teachers ultimately invest in developing their understanding and support of the educational model.

Rath also found that it is essential for all teachers before joining the program to have information about the sponsor's basic philosophy, techniques, practices, and materials, as well as about the other adults (aides, parents, support staff) they will work with, and the structure and implementation of the planning and training. Knowing what to expect on a day-to-day and week-by-week basis helps

teachers deal with the stress of change in adopting a new curriculum model and in maintaining positive attitudes.

These positive attitudes and behavior toward change are, of course, assisted if a respected on-site principal, director, trainer, or coordinator serves as a program advocate in order to "convert" teachers and facilitate attitudinal change and commitment. This is particularly important if barriers in the local school district hinder teachers from being selected on a voluntary basis, or if there is significant staff turnover or reorganization.

Rath's research also concluded that cross-site and within-site contacts between and among staff maintain enthusiasm for the instructional approach and infused new ideas into the project. When sharing of experiences, ideas, and concerns was sponsored through the Follow Through model or within the school district, teachers appeared to feel that there was sincere support of their efforts and of the improvement of the educational model.

Use of Evaluation and Research

The early idealists of the Follow Through program did not foresee massive funding cuts, reduction of staff, political implications and barriers within local districts, teacher contract disputes, personality conflicts between sponsors and local educators, or the various educational fads and interests which have influenced education in the past

decade. The primary survivors of the seventies are those who were able to assess the results of each instructional year with their staffs and decide what elements of the model and its implementation helped or hindered students' academic achievement.

One of the most useful studies related to these issues has been Stallings' Follow Through observation study (Stallings, 1975) and related research (Stallings, Cory, Fairweather, and Needles, 1977; Fisher and others, 1978; Harneschfeger and Wiley, 1978; Stallings, 1980). Stallings' work and that of her colleagues are examples of the ways researchers can help relate theoretical concepts to specific goals, behaviors, and interactions. For example, Stallings has worked to conceptualize measurable evaluation goals and performance-based outcomes based on observed instructional processes. The variables used to describe the instructional process through a Classroom Environment Scale developed by Stallings and co-workers are more specific than variables used in previous research on teaching reading. By the mid-seventies, the Classroom Environment Scale and other evaluation techniques to a more precise degree allowed instructional leaders to decide a) how specifically the instructional model was being implemented; b) the amount of time devoted to academic and non-academic practices; and c) the variables most highly correlated with achievement. With such information, effective sites adapted into their models concepts such as allocated learning time, student engaged time, distribution of time across activities, and interactive instruction. Relying on this and additional evaluation and research, a number of capable instructional

leaders with their staffs have been able to guide their programs through uncharted political and educational waters of the past decade.

Interestingly, the sites relying on evaluation and research lessons to improve model effectiveness have emphasized teacher participation and understanding. When research data are demystified and translated into specific behaviors as in the Stallings reports, teachers have a more specific understanding of what is expected from them. The rationale and theory of the model becomes concrete.

Systematic Inservice Training

Closely related to evaluation, research, and model development is inservice training. Inservice education has been often typified as one of the weaker components of American education. Much of the criticism about inservice education has focused on its irrelevancy, the lack of a conceptual framework, minor or no participant planning, an overemphasis on theory and lecture, and limited long-range follow-up throughout the instructional year.

Successful instructional leaders have provided inservice training in a manner which provides a model for classroom instruction: a) needs assessments of participants' strengths and weaknesses; b) development of a long range plan with focused priorities; c) provisions of choices when possible; d) sensitivity to participant participation and values; e) consideration of learning styles and learning theory; f) applications in and related to practical settings.

As budgets are reduced, many educators are looking to inservice programs which have been successfully implemented with minimal money. Numerous researchers have documented that good inservice programs are built within sites which incorporate the preceding inservice qualities into day-to-day teacher supervision and counseling, as well as relying on staff conducted programs based on teacher strengths and interests (Kozberg and Winegar, 1981).

Sites and programs in which inservice goals are related to evaluation priorities, model improvement and implementation, and performance based outcomes tend to edge out those which are unfocused and unrelated to day-to-day experiences of their teachers.

Community Support and Political Advocacy

There have been numerous programs that have failed educationally while maintaining strong community support and politically rewarding ties within the school district or government. This is not to deny, however, that effective school sites must work to develop parent involvement and political advocates within their community if they are to survive. The first community contact within any school is the parents. The Phi Delta Kappan Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools (1980) found that all of their "successful" Title I poverty schools worked to help parents feel like an integral part of the educational process. In a number of the schools, parents were involved in decision-making processes. All eight case study schools had parent advisory committees and

educational programs, and informal parent-school partnerships.

In addition to parents, Kozberg and Winegar (1981) define community as extending beyond neighborhood boundaries and model sponsors to include social service agencies, cultural and medical institutions, local colleges and universities, local businesses and industry, as well as the school's primary community of parents. All these groups are useful as part of an alliance to a) establish awareness of successful educational programs; b) provide evaluation feedback to program strengths, weaknesses, and goals; and c) develop a political network of support and advocacy as funding and program continuation become crucial issues.

Local district and community support alone does not solve the problems of implementation. But this support is a critical basis for success. Teachers, administrators, parents within the model and the local district have agreed on a unique educational plan for an individual school. Within the proposal must be specific goals, identified and accepted responsibilities and specific evaluation plans. It seems apparent that this should be a major step funded projects must now take.

Now that we know some of the lessons of the past decade, can they be applied to a non-funded target school which has frustrations similar to Follow Through projects of the past ten years? Can the shortcomings be avoided and the strengths be applied?

To find out, we applied a number of the Follow Through lessons - strong leadership, model development and modification, inservice training, research and evaluation, and political advocacy - to a low-income elementary

school (kindergarten through six) in Lawrence, Kansas, the site of Kansas University.

Lawrence is located in eastern Kansas, approximately forty miles from Kansas City, Missouri. Although it has a large middle class, white collar population connected to the university or to professional positions in Kansas City, is also has a significant population of working class minority families who reside in Lawrence's public housing neighborhoods. Children from these families are almost all assigned to East Heights Elementary School. East Heights has the lowest achievement scores among elementary schools in Lawrence. Teachers traditionally have been frustrated about student achievement, behavior, and attitudes toward school and authority figures.

The school generally has had a reputation for difficulties with student and teacher alienation, low morale, high turnover, and less than ideal relationships with parents and community. However, the school is presently fortunate in having Principal Charles Becker, who is an educational leader committed to turning things around at East Heights.

Becker had spent more than enough time with discipline problems, poor achievement results, and low morale. He took advantage of the university's presence to seek a sympathetic faculty member to help him and his staff identify an educational model that might reduce some of the overwhelming problems at East Heights. Through this university contact, Becker was able to initiate review of research findings and exemplary models with a number of consultants from the university and the Kansas City, Missouri area.

Unfortunately, when teachers came together to hear about and discuss research and models, they found no easy answers available for them. Their school had little or no access to large or long term funding, and a number of the staff had different perceptions of the priorities needed in their school. However, through the principal's persistent follow-up and the continued contact and commitment of the university instructor who donated her time, East Heights teachers conducted a survey of their own concerns, analyzed factors which most frustrated staff members, and determined what curriculum changes had the most support and interest. The survey showed that teachers were most frustrated by behavior and attitudes of students. It also was found that teachers supported the idea of broadening the curriculum to include attention to social studies and science through thematic units integrating such content with basic skills.

After a skeleton model was drafted with a committee of teachers, the principal sought support from the Lawrence School District administration. East Heights had established a need, a desire to change, and a specific action plan. This initiative resulted in some minor funding and beneficial politicking. For example, East Heights was assigned an additional paraprofessional and the district agreed to pay for a consultant to assist in leadership training. However, since the district provides the "field laboratory" for the university within the city, it was agreed that there was not to be a fee paid to a university consultant. Thus the local school district was willing to consider financial assistance for an individual

school with no federal program involved. This support was creatively handled, a university trade-off. Administration also agreed that at this time East Heights achievement would not be unduly compared to other, more middle class, schools in the district. The staff would have the opportunity and responsibility to set their own school goals, and measure achievement in relation to these goals.

In addition to district support, East Heights sought support from outside agencies. Several possibilities for additional support were explored. The university agreed to encourage student teachers who desired to be involved in the development of the model to elect assignment for their student teaching experience to East Heights. Seven student teachers per semester were assigned to East Heights this year. Student teachers are involved as members of the team, taking part in all planning meetings.

By the end of this first year, East Heights had secured enough funding and support and conducted a two-day planning workshop in order to complete a behavior code and experimental curriculum plan for involving students in science and social studies. Thus inservice was adapted to the needs of this particular school.

During this planning workshop, staff members agreed that evaluation of the effectiveness of the model needed to be formative in order that minor changes could be made as the model evolved. Weekly staff meetings became forums for sharing ideas and concerns about the behavior and curriculum models. Regular staff meeting information was handled through

written memos.

A more formal end of the year assessment was selected to assess the models in relation to research findings, and to examine specific components for refinement. The assessment will be done by teachers, student teachers, the administrative leader, parent representatives, district administrative representatives, and the consultant. Through this assessment the tasks begin again and more refined models are planned for the next year.

CONCLUSION

It is our belief that local districts must now utilize what we have learned from funded projects to determine what types of support can be given to target schools. The first step would be an assessment of present models giving strong consideration to recommendations from the staff working within the model itself.

Secondly, schools must be involved in inservice training which assists in constructing a specific description of the model and identifying specific responsibilities of team members.

Third, districts should evaluate their current evaluation techniques, measures, and methods. Merely comparing standardized achievement scores between buildings is insufficient. Evaluation must be school specific to help schools assess their strengths and weaknesses, identify specific expectations for teachers, students and administrators, and relate outcomes to an educational model or framework.

Fourth, we need to encourage the local community to provide support to the school. There are many community agencies (educational and non-educational) which could offer support to such projects.

Although many of the results of government funded programs like Follow Through are discouraging, we have learned valuable lessons. One of these is the conclusion that money alone will not provide adequate educational opportunity for all children. Educational change and improvement are ultimately the result of singular dedication, personal leadership, one-to-one encounters, small group relationships, and conscientious decisions by individuals to find and implement the best ways available to meet the educational needs of children.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE INFORMAL EVALUATION

FOR PLANNING EXERCISES

Follow Through Model _____

Location _____

Rate each component of the model by use of the following descriptions:

No 0 = not included in the model; not at all effective in model
Weak 1 = included within the model but a definite weakness
Strong 2 = a definite strength within the model

Components:

1. Educational Leader			
Overall Effectiveness	0	1	2
Curriculum Leadership	0	1	2
2. Parent and Community Involvement			
Parent Support to School	0	1	2
School Support to Parents	0	1	2
Community Support and Participation	0	1	2
3. Teacher Attitude			
Toward Children	0	1	2
Support for Model	0	1	2
4. Student Attitude			
Attendance	0	1	2
5. Implmentation of Educational Plan (The following plan is from the Switzer Follow Through Model sponsored by Prentice-Hall, Kansas City, Missouri.)			
a. Languaging Time	0	1	2
b. Thematic Unit	0	1	2
c. Learning Center	0	1	2
d. Classroom Enrichment Center	0	1	2
e. Mastery Basic Sight Words	0	1	2
f. Instruction for Monolingual Spanish Speakers	0	1	2
6. Evaluation			
Goals Identified and Accepted	0	1	2
Realistic Standards for Population	0	1	2
Success Toward Achievement of Goals	0	1	2
Instruments Appropriate for Measuring Effectiveness of Goals	0	1	2

_____

Identifier:

Teacher	0
Building Administrator	1
District Administrator	2
Sponsor/Outside Consultant	3
Parent/Advisory Committee	4

East Heights Elementary School
Lawrence, Kansas

Behavior Code

In order to provide an atmosphere conducive to maximum learning, to create a pleasant environment for students and faculty, to teach children good study and citizenship habits and to recognize those students who achieve these ideals, we will be using the following behavior code for East Heights students:

---show respect for teachers and others in authority;
---do assignments promptly and honestly;
---develop personal responsibility without constant supervision;
---respect the property rights of others, public or private;
---be courteous at all times;
---respect traffic and safety regulations at all times and in all places;
---actively participate in group activities;
---use speech not contaminated with profanity;
---pupils are not to throw stones, snowballs or other missiles on or near the school grounds;
---pupils are not to make improper advances toward a member of the opposite sex at school or at any school activity;
---pupils are not to bring firearms, ammunition, slingshorts, knives or other dangerous items to school;
---pupils are to use restrooms for the intended purposes; not to throw water, write on walls, hold meetings with friends, etc.

We as a staff feel that these rules are very reasonable and are simply the kinds of behavior which are expected by you as parents, by our community and by our society. Failure to live within these rules will be dealt with in the following manner:

---each teacher will have a chart of all her students. The chart will be divided into three sections; inside behavior, outside behavior, and lunchroom behavior. The chart will be started for two weeks and repeated in similar fashion throughout the year.
---All infractions will be recorded on this two week chart.
---The first two offenses will be handled by the classroom teacher or any adult observing the misbehavior. These first two offenses will be treated as warnings.
---The third offense will be considered a "suspendable" offense. At this time parents will be contacted and the consequences discussed with a decision made by the principal. "Suspendable" offense is defined in many ways, for example: taken out of school for a minimum of 3 days, suspension from recess, assemblies, the Learning Center, Field Trips, etc., or placed in a study center area without privileges. The decision will be based on the severity of the offense and the conference with parents, student, teacher and principal.
---Students who have received no warnings on their charts over the two week period will receive:

1. A Very Important Person Button which will earn them: unsupervised hall movement with teacher permission or any other special jobs and privileges that require responsible behavior.
2. These students will also be recognized at assemblies, all school messages over the intercom and by notes to parents. These students are our leaders and should be given proper recognition by all.

At the end of the two weeks everyone starts over with a new chart-- the slate is wiped clean." We as a staff know this project will take a tremendous amount of work and consistent supervision on our part. We are willing to do the job and do it right because we know if we succeed we will have the number one elementary school in Lawrence.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. B., St. Pierre, R. G., Proper, E. C., & Stebbins, L. B. Pardon us, but what was the question again? A response to the critique of the Follow Through evaluation. Harvard Educational Review, May 1978, 48, 161-170.

Clark, V. L. Revelations, responses, reinforcement; an overview of the research pertaining to the young child. The Journal of Negro Education, Sum 1979, 48, 288-305.

Clark, V. L., Latto, L. S., & McCarthy, M. M. Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, March 1980, 61, 467-470.

Edmonds, R. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, October 1979, 15-18.

Fisher, C. W., Filby, N. N., Marliave, R. L., Cahen, L. S., Dishaw, M. M., Moore, Y. E., & Berliner, D. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. Far West Regional Laboratory, San Francisco, California, 1978.

Hampton, P. J. Innovative strategies for teaching low income and minority students. Teacher Educator, Spring 1980, 15, 15-23.

Harnischfeger, A. & Wiley, D. Conceptual and policy issues in elementary school teacher-learning. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March 1978.

Hodges, W. L. & Sheehan, R. Follow Through as ten years of experimentation: What have we learned? Young Children, November, 1978, 34, 4-14.

Hodges, W. The worth of the Follow Through experience. Harvard Educational Review, May 1978, 18, 186-191.

House, E. R., Glass, G. V., McLean, L. D., Walker, D. F. No simple answer: Critique of the Follow Through evaluation, Harvard Educational Review, May 1978, 48, 128-160.

Kozberg, G. & Winegar, J. The South Boston story: Implications for secondary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, April 1981, 62, 565-569.

Moore, S. G. Abt report of Follow Through: Critique and comment. Young Children, Summer 1978, 33, 52-56.

Moore, S. G. Past Research and Current Prospectives on Head Start and Follow Through. Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, Summer 1979, 55, 75-82.

Rath, S. W. & Sposito, P., Chapin, R. & Newton, K. Follow Through: A story of educational change. Nero and Associates, Inc., Portland, Oregon, June 1976.

St. Pierre, R. G. Follow Through Debate. Curriculum Inquiry, Summer 1979, 9, 149-161.

Stallings, J. Effective teaching and learning in urban schools. Paper prepared for the National Conference on Urban Education, Cemrel Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, July 1978.

Stallings, J. Implementation and child effects of teaching practices in Follow Through classrooms. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1975, 40 (Serial No. 163).

Stallings, J., Cory, R., Fairweather, J. & Needels, M. Early childhood evaluation. SRI International, Menlo Park, California, November, 1977.

Stallings, J. & Kaskowitz, D. Follow Through class observation evaluation. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.

Zigler, E. and Seitz, V. Early Childhood Intervention Programs: A Re-analysis. School Psychology Review, Fall 1980 9, 354-368.